



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

wanting. If Moses did not write the Pentateuch, it is of course gratuitous to say that he did not write it in cuneiform. In any case, one may wonder where Moses, whose legislative activity was all exercised in the desert, succeeded in finding the clay for his cuneiform tablets. Again, if the Pentateuch was written on cuneiform tablets, why is the specific term for "tablet," viz., לִיָּתָה, used only in connection with the stone tablets of the Decalogue? Elsewhere in the Pentateuch the law of Moses is described as written in a סֵפֶר. This term is used in Jer., chap. 36, in connection with מִגִּלָּתָה, "the roll of the book." Cuneiform tablets were never rolled up. In the story of Jeremiah's purchase of a field (Jer., chap. 32) סֵפֶר denotes the title-deed, and the record at first sight reads very much as if that deed were written on a clay tablet. But, on the other hand, every statement made in the record is equally well satisfied on the supposition that papyrus was used. It is sound philology to hold that סֵפֶר means the same thing in similar contexts everywhere, until we have definite proof of the existence of another meaning.

As to the second claim, that the prophets wrote in Aramaic and that Hebrew did not arise as a literary tongue till about the first Christian century, space forbids adequate discussion. That such a radical change in the language of Scripture as this, at so late a date, should have escaped mention in any literature would be almost unbelievable. Further, that Hebrew should have been the dialect spoken only around Jerusalem is more easily alleged than proved. Indeed, Dr. Naville himself refers to the Canaanite glosses in the Amarna letters as Hebrew (p. 37), and rightly so. Yet these Hebrew words and forms come from such places as Megiddo and Hazur. What then becomes of Hebrew as a local dialect of Judah? The author's attention might also be called to Breasted's article on the origins of the Phoenician alphabet, in *AJSL*, XXXII (1916), which appeared too late to be reckoned with in these lectures.

J. M. POWIS SMITH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

#### A NEW TEXTBOOK ON HEBREW RELIGION<sup>1</sup>

This book belongs to the series of "Handbooks of Ethics and Religion," designed mainly for use as college textbooks. It is not usually the aim of such books to strike out on new and independent lines of

<sup>1</sup> *The Origin and Growth of the Hebrew Religion*. By Professor Henry Thatcher Fowler. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1916. xv+190 pages. \$1.00.

investigation, but rather to present the generally accepted results of historical criticism concisely, accurately, clearly, and, if the writer has the happy gift, attractively. Certainly the last quality is by no means the least important, for it is the mission of such books not so much to satisfy an interest in the subject already awakened as to create an interest.

The present little work fulfils these requirements in large measure. It is not weighted with the pros and cons on mooted questions which might have great interest for scholars but very little for the youthful reader. The main themes of the book are therefore allowed to stand out clearly so that they can be grasped without difficulty, and the summary at the close gathers up the results of the previous studies succinctly and forcibly. A definite impression is thus left upon the reader's mind, and this is most desirable. This impression will enable him to proceed farther into biblical studies with a correct sense of direction. The book furnishes excellent starting-points for more detailed reading and study. Finally, the material is presented attractively. The book is pleasant reading, though I cannot say that it is calculated to pique curiosity or to challenge attention by any very striking or picturesque way of putting things. But the necessary conventionality of the textbook and picturesqueness of treatment are qualities difficult to combine.

The general critical attitude of Professor Fowler may be seen in the following extracts. He is interested in tracing back to Moses the sources of the moral elements rather than the cult elements in Hebrew religion. Budde's covenant theory, Paton's emphasis upon Jahweh's pity and power in the redemption of Israel from Egypt, and Wellhausen's emphasis upon Jahweh's justice in the "decisions" at Kadesh are the roots of the moralized religion of the Hebrews. The nimbus which gathers round the figure of David is of course dissipated in the usual way. Isaiah still teaches the inviolability of Zion in 701, though just why he should have done so when the country was apostatizing from Jahweh under the leadership of the Egyptian party is not explained (p. 92). A hesitating position is adopted with reference to the specifically messianic prophecies in Isaiah (pp. 93, 155). It is interesting to notice, by the way, how doubts of these prophecies are finally making their way into popularizations of the historical treatment of the Old Testament. The significance of Jeremiah and Ezekiel for the development of individualism is properly underscored, though a much-needed criticism, or suggestion of criticism, of Ezekiel's doctrine of individual

responsibility is missing. The identification of the servant in Deutero-Isaiah is left somewhat in doubt, though with leanings toward the theory of his identification with the remnant. For my own part I should have preferred to see the individualistic interpretation of the servant definitely eliminated. One of the most useful features of the book is the very well-selected series of Scripture passages at the beginning of each chapter, which it is intended that the student should examine before reading the chapter. These passages will undoubtedly prove to be most helpful in quickening the student's interest in the following discussion. Professor Fowler has not allowed any controversial element to enter into his book. The impression which it makes is altogether constructive. The student is introduced to the modern view of the Old Testament as if it were a matter of course. This is in keeping with the sound pedagogical theories which obviously underlie the arrangement and general treatment of the subject. Teachers will find Professor Fowler's work a very serviceable handbook on a theme which has a perennial interest and importance, even in the din of these wild days.

KEMPER FULLERTON

OBERLIN GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

### A PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION OF JESUS

Two portly and expensive volumes<sup>1</sup> represent the culmination of President Hall's long-continued and monumental activities in his chosen field, and have been awaited with great expectation. They rightly claim the interest and appreciation of many students. The title is likely to mislead the general reader; the work is not a contribution to the study of Jesus, but to the study of genetic psychology. Librarians need to note this in cataloguing it. The student who wishes to know what Jesus said and did, or to understand the Gospels, will find only incidental benefit here; it is not the psychology of Jesus which is treated, but the psychology of those who have reflected on Jesus. How the human mind has reacted upon this name; above all, how a modern encyclopedic mind, superlatively trained in psychological analysis, reacts upon it, is exhaustively and illuminatingly presented. The distinction between the original fact and the reaction upon it is unimportant for the author's purpose, and is rarely drawn. It is easier and more productive to psychologize the reaction. For example, it is obviously quite mean-

<sup>1</sup> *Jesus the Christ in the Light of Psychology*. By G. Stanley Hall. New York: Doubleday Page & Co., 1917. 2 vols. xix+733 pages. \$7.50 net.